



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/798,430

03/12/2004

Manabu Nakamura

250364US2

6547

22850

7590

09/20/2006

C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND  
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

TSUI, WILSON W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/798,430	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NAKAMURA, MANABU	
	<b>Examiner</b> Wilson Tsui	<b>Art Unit</b> 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/6/2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This application is in response to the amendment filed on: 7/06/2006.
2. Claims 1, 10, 17, 18, 22, 23, and 25, have been amended, and claim 24 has been canceled. Claims 1-23, and 25 remain pending, and claims 1, 22, and 23 are independent claims.
3. The previous rejections for claims 1-5, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369), claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan in further view of Reshef et al (US Patent: 6,865,593), claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan and Reshef et al, in further view of Nielson (US Patent: 5,875,443). claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan in further view of Reshef et al, Nielson, and Brown et al (US Application: 2003/0131316 A1), claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan in further view of Rizzo (US Patent: 6,470,338 B1), Claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan in further view of Rivera (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1), and Shafron et al (US Application: US 2003/0014479 A1), Claims 17, 18, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan in view of Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1), claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan in further view of Kolsy, and Meffert et al (US Application: US 2003/0037261 A1), and claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan in further view of Matsuda et al (US Application: US 2001/0029521 A1), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 17, 18, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000) in further view of Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001).

With regards to claim 1, Saravanan teaches an information providing apparatus for providing prescribed information to a user terminal comprising:

a) *A receiving unit configured to receive a user's request for a frame page containing said prescribed information from the user terminal:* whereas a server receives a request for a frame containing the desired/prescribed information from the client/user terminal (paragraph 0029). Additionally, a receiving unit in a server is configured to receive a first user request for data, which includes a client's request for frame data (paragraph 0025: whereas a client requests a frame page containing prescribed information/content that was sent from a user's client terminal).

b) *A frame page creator configured to create the requested frame page:* the server creates a frame page having a plurality of frames to be displayed on the client/user terminal based upon the user's request (Fig 2, paragraph 0040: whereas, the prescribed

information is located in a first frame (reference number 204: known as the workspace frame) among other frames, such as the navigation frame (reference number 202)

c) *The frame page creator including a loading page module* (paragraph 0061: whereas a first web page is created and sent to be loaded on the client device (information display device), and the first web page comprises a workspace frame and a navigation frame which is used for loading prescribed information, including workspace and navigation content), *configured to extract identification information specifying said prescribed information from a first URL designated in the first request*: whereas, each frame page has associated identification information from a URL (paragraph 0029: whereas, a web page location is identified using the information in a URL/hyperlink, and also when the URL identification information refers the web page content location, then the frame page is created and loaded in the client's browser cache), *a frame page module configured to create the frame page having a plurality of frames with said prescribed information displayed in a first frame among said frames, according to the argument described by the loading module*: whereas, based on the specific content requested, the loading module includes inherently specifies arguments for the frame page module such that the frame page containing prescribed information is created (whereas, inherency for the arguments being specified, is based on the teachings that a *specific* frame page is created based upon the identification data in a URL request, as explained above, and thus arguments have been specified by the loading page module). In addition the frame page has a plurality of frames are displayed/loaded (and thus also acts as a frame page loader) on the client/user terminal (Fig 2, paragraph

Art Unit: 2178

0040: whereas, the prescribed information is located in a first frame (reference number 204: known as the workspace frame) among other frames, such as the navigation frame (reference number 202) to be loaded into the client device for display).

However, Saravanan does not expressly teach *creating a loading page describing an argument for calling the requested frame page and used to load the frame page based on the identification information and a frame page module configured to receive the argument via the loading page and to create the frame page according to the argument described in the loading page.*

Kolsy teaches *creating a loading page describing an argument for calling the requested frame page and used to load the frame page based on the identification information and a frame page module configured to receive the argument via the loading page and to create the frame page according to the argument described in the loading page* (Kolsy, paragraph 0025: whereas a frames page/loading page is sent to the client for the purpose of loading specific frame data. Furthermore, as explained in the Abstract (Abstract of Kolsy), the loading page sent to the client also includes a target web page sent in response to a request, such that the target web page will establish the frame page for which the target web content is in a first frame, and an advertisement is in a second frame of a frame page. Thus, the target web page acts as the loading page to call/request a frame page for generation from a frame page module such that a first frame is specified (the argument) directly or indirectly to include the target web content based upon identification information in the request (Kolsy, Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan et al's loading module, to further include the ability to create a loading page, as taught by Kolsy. The combination of Saravanan, and Kolsy would have allowed Saravanan to have implemented an apparatus for loading web pages and to also have modified associated data ... without having to recode the web page (Kolsy, paragraph 0006).

With regards to claim 2, Saravanan teaches the information providing apparatus of claim 1, *wherein the frame page creator is configured to create the frame page such that second that second information associated with said prescribed information is to be displayed in a second frame so as to match the prescribed information displayed in the first frame* (Fig. 11, paragraph 0059: whereas, a second frame (reference number 1102), is associated with the content of the workspace frame (reference number 1106), since the second frame is a site map/navigational structure, that is associated with the navigation/location of the workspace frame data displayed in the second frame.

With regards to claim 3, for an information providing apparatus of claim 2, performing a similar method as the method in claim 2, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 4, Saravanan teaches *an information providing apparatus of claim 2, wherein the second information is to be displayed in a tree structure in the second frame* (Fig. 11, paragraph 0059: whereas a tree structure is shown in the second frame (reference number 1102)).

With regards to claim 5, Saravanan teaches an information providing apparatus of claim 1, *wherein the frame page creator is configured to create the frame page such that the*

Art Unit: 2178

*frame page is to be displayed according to a layout designated by the identification information contained in the first URL: whereas, the server acts as the frame page creator which creates a frame page and adjusts the layout of the frame page, based on the identification information sent by user navigation selection (Fig. 4). Furthermore, the selection is based on the first URL as explained in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.*

With regards to claim 17, which is dependent on claim 1, Saravanan teaches an information providing apparatus comprising a *loading page module*, as explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

However Saravan does not expressly teach *wherein the receiving unit receives a second request containing a second URL without a path name from the user terminal prior to receipt of the first request, and the loading page module creates the loading page in response to the second request.*

Kolsy teaches an information providing apparatus comprising: *defining an instruction for causing the user terminal to load the frame page, wherein the receiving unit receives a second request containing a second URL without a path name from the user terminal prior to receipt of the first request, and the loading page creator creates the loading page in response to the second request* (paragraph 0025: *whereas, a frames page/loading page is sent to the client/user-terminal for loading, prior to the receipt of the first request (request for an advertisement), in response to a second request containing a URL without a path name (a web site is addressed without path information)).*



Art Unit: 2178

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan's loading page creator to further include the ability to create a loading page when a URL does not have a path name as taught by Kolsy. The combination of Saravanan and Kolsy would have allowed Saravanan to have implemented an apparatus for loading web pages without knowing the path information in advance.

With regards to claim 18, for an information providing apparatus of claim 17, Saravanan teaches *identification information contained in the first URL designated by the user terminal*, as explained in the rejection for claim 1 above. However, Saravanan does not teach the identification information *includes argument information that is contained in the second URL and described in the loading page*.

*Kolsy teaches identification information includes argument information that is contained in the second URL and described in the loading page*: whereas, the identification information is the identification of a web site address in a second URL (paragraph 0025), and furthermore, is used as argument information in the first URL and described in the loading page (paragraph 0031: whereas, the client sends a first URL request for content, where the first URL request specifically requests a content web page, and thus inherently includes the URL argument which specifies an address without path information). Also taught in paragraph 0031, is the script in the loading page makes the call for the first URL request.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan's loading page creator to further include the

ability to include argument data that is issued in a second request in a first request as taught by Kolsy. The combination of Saravanan and Kolsy would have allowed Saravanan's system to have been able to have tailored the creation of pages by using a system of identification information exchange.

With regards to claim 22, for an information providing apparatus performing a similar method as the apparatus in claim 1, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 23, Saravanan teaches an information displaying device comprising:

*a) A web page requesting means that transmits a first request for a web page to an information providing apparatus connected via a network, the first request containing a URL including identification information for specifying target information: whereas a client (information display device) sends a first request for a frame containing the desired/prescribed information (paragraph 0029). Furthermore, the URL contains associated identification information (paragraph 0029: whereas, a web page location is identified as the information in a URL)*

*b) A receiving means that receives a definition of the requested web page from the information providing apparatus (paragraph 0029: whereas, an information displaying device (client) receives a definition of the requested web page/frame in response to a URL request).*

*c) A displaying means that displays a frame page with the target information viewed in one of a plurality of frames formed in the frame page (Fig 2, paragraph 0040: whereas, the target information is located in a first frame (reference number 204: known as the*

Art Unit: 2178

workspace frame) among other frames, such as the navigation frame (reference number 202)).

d) *Loading means that loads the frame page*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

e) *Wherein the web page requesting means transmits a second request containing a second URL to the information providing apparatus prior to transmitting the first request*, as explained in the rejection for claim 17, and is rejected under the same rationale.

f) *The receiving means receives a loading page defining an instruction for loading the frame page from the information providing apparatus, and the loading means loads the frame page based on the loading page*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 25, for an information display apparatus of claim 23, performing a method similar to the information providing apparatus of claim 17, is rejected under the same rationale.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000) and Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001), in further view of Reshef et al (US Patent: 6,865,593 B1, published: Mar. 8, 2005, filed: Jun. 12, 2000).

With regards to claim 6, Saravanan and Kolsey teaches an information providing apparatus of claim 1, *wherein the frame page creator is configured to create the frame page such that the frame page is to be displayed*, as explained in the rejection for claim

1 above, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Saravanan does not teach the frame page is *displayed with a language designated by the identification information contained in the first URL*.

Reshef et al teaches a web page is *displayed with a language designated by the identification information contained in a URL* (columns 14 and 15, lines 65-57 and 1-2 respectively: whereas, a web page is displayed in English based upon the identification information contained in a URL).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan and Kolsy's frame page creator to be configured such that it would create a frame/web-page based on an interpretation of the language designated by identification information contained in a URL as taught by Reshef et al.

The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, and Reshef et al would have allowed Saravanan's information providing apparatus to have displayed framed data in a language that was native to the users of the apparatus.

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000) and Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001), in further view of Reshef et al (US Patent: 6,865,593 B1, issued: Mar. 8, 2005, filed: Jun. 12, 2000) and Nielson (US Patent: 5,875,443, issued: Feb 23, 1999, filed: Jan 30, 1996).

With regards to claim 7, Saravanan, Kolsy, and Reshef et al teaches an information providing apparatus of claim 6, which comprises a determination unit for *determining the*

*language that is designated by the identification information*, as explained in the rejection for claim 6 above, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Saravanan does not teach the determination unit determines whether the language designated by the identification information *is supported by the information providing apparatus*.

Nielson teaches a determination unit for *determining the language designated by the identification information is supported by a database system* (column 8, lines 12-16: whereas a check is performed to see if a language is supported by a database system using the language identification information retrieved from a URL as further explained in column 7, lines 48-65).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan, Kolsy, and Reshef et al's determination unit, such that it would be further configured to determine whether the language designated by the identification information is supported by a particular system/apparatus, as taught by Nielson. The combination of Saravanan, Reshef et al, would have allowed Saravanan's information providing apparatus to have been able include error checking for language support.

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000) and Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001), in further view of Reshef et al (US Patent: 6,865,593 B1, issued: Mar. 8, 2005, filed: Jun. 12, 2000) and Nielson (US Patent:

5,875,443, issued: Feb. 23, 1999, filed: Jan. 30, 1996) and Brown et al (US Application: 2003/0131316 A1, published: Jul. 10, 2003, filed: Jan. 7 2002).

With regards to claim 8, Saravanan, Kolsy, Reshef et al, and Nielson teach an information providing apparatus of claim 7, which comprises:

a) *A frame page creator configured to create the frame page such that the frame page is to be displayed with a language*, as explained in the rejection of claim 7 above, and is rejected under the same rationale.

b) A determination unit to determine if the language designated by the identification information is supported by the information providing apparatus, as explained in the rejection of claim 7 above, and is rejected under the same rationale.

However, Saravanan, Kolsy, Reshef et al, and Nielson do not teach displaying a language *used in an operations panel of the image providing apparatus if the language designated by the identification information is not supported* by the information providing apparatus.

Brown et al teaches an information providing apparatus that comprises a determination unit used to determine that should a *language indicated by a language indicator* not be supported, then a default language is displayed in the operations panel of the information providing apparatus (paragraph 0024: whereas, using language indicator data retrieved from the client, a default language is displayed if the language designated by the indicator is not supported).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan, Kolsy, Reshef et al, and Nielson's determination

unit and frame page creator such that a default language is displayed in the operations panel of the information providing apparatus, as taught by Brown et al. The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, Reshef et al, Nielson, and Brown et al would have allowed Saravanan's information providing apparatus to have been able to default to a particular a language to have avoided an unknown operational state when a language requested is not supported.

8. Claims 9, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000) and Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001), in further view of Rizzo et al (US Patent: 6,470,338 B1, published: Oct. 22, 2002, filed: Jul. 7, 2000).

With regards to claim 9, Saravanan teaches an information providing apparatus of claim 1, *where the frame page creator is configured to create the frame page such that the frame page is to be displayed in a user mode designated by the identification information* (paragraph 0050: whereas, the server, acting as the frame page creator, takes user identification data and password to determine the level of access, for restricting access to specific frame based information). Furthermore, Saravanan teaches requesting a frame page using a URL as explained in the rejection for claim 1 above. However, Saravanan does not teach user mode *identification is contained in the first URL*.

Rizzo et al teaches user mode *identification and password contained in a URL* (column 8, lines 1-10: whereas user ID and password is embedded in a URL).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan's first URL request for a frame page to further include user identification information embedded in an URL as taught by Rizzo et al. The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, and Rizzo et al, would have allowed Saravanan's system to incorporated identification information in a URL such that "it can be passed to the system automatically" (Rizzo et al, column 8, lines 1-10).

With regards to claim 10, which depends on claim 1, Saravanan, Kolsy teach and Rizzo et al teach an information providing apparatus that receives identification information contained in an URL, such *that the identification information is included as an argument in the loading page*, as explained in the rejection for claim 1 (since the loading page calls the target web page indicated in the URL), and is rejected under the same rationale.

9. Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000) and Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001), in further view of Rivera et al (US Application: US 2002/0107699 A1, published: Aug. 8, 2002) and Shafron et al (US Application: US 2003/0014479 A1, published: Jul. 10, 2003, filed: Jan. 7, 2002).

With regards to claim 11, Saravanan teaches an information providing apparatus, comprising:

a) A frame page creator, for creating a *frame page* having a plurality of frames, as described in claim 1 above, and is rejected under the same rationale.



- b) *Format information that defines a format of the frame page* (paragraph 0010: whereas, format instructions are used as format information to define the format of a second web page that contains frames).
- c) *Identification information contained in the first URL*, as described in claim 1 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
- d) Frame instructions for creating a frame can include instructions in a java based language (paragraph 0011).

However, Saravanan does not teach the frame page creator is configured to *apply the* identification information contained in the first URL *to the format information to create the* frame page.

Shafron et al teaches *identification information contained in a URL* converted to XML data (paragraphs 0062-0068: whereas, the URL identifies the location of a web page, and is converted into XML data).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan's apparatus for applying format and identification information, to further include the method for converting the information to XML data. The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, and Shafron et al would have allowed Saravanan's apparatus to have used one of the standard methods for data exchange between systems of varying platforms.

However, Saravanan, Kolsy, and Rivera et al do not teach *applying the* identification information using the XML data *to create a frame page*.

Rivera et al teaches an information providing apparatus that comprises: *Format information that defines the format of a frame page*, for which the format information is used with XML data to *create a frame page* (paragraph 0040: whereas, format information is contained in XSL data, and is combined with XML content data to create a frame page). Furthermore the XSL data is chosen based on user identification data, or user-level data when formatting a frame page (paragraph 0038).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan, Kolsy, and Shafron et al's frame page creator, to also include the ability to use the format information in an XSL file with XML data, to create a frame page based on identification data as taught by Rivera et al. The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, Shafron et al and Rivera et al would have allowed Saravanan's system to have "moved data to and from .... systems in a seamless, low impact, fashion" (paragraph 0006).

With regards to claim 12, Saravanan, Kolsy, Rivera et al, and Shafron et al teach an information providing apparatus of claim 11, comprising: *a data converting unit configured to convert the identification information of a prescribed format into a format suitable for creation of the frame page, wherein the frame page creator creates the frame page based on the converted identification information*, as explained in claim 11 above, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 13, Saravanan, Kolsy, Rivera et al, and Shafron et al teach an information providing apparatus of claim 12, comprising *a data converting unit used by the frame page creator*, as explained in claim 11, and is rejected under the same

rationale. However, Saravanan, Kolsy, Rivera et al, and Shafron et al do not teach the data converting unit is *used by web page creators*.

Yet, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art for to use the data converting unit in combination with the technology of a frame page creator (which creates frames for display in a web browser), to also incorporate the same data/technology using a data converting unit in a web page creator (which also creates web pages). The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this. It would have been advantageous to utilize this combination because accommodate a common means of information exchange between the web page creation and frame creation.

With regards to claim 14, Saravanan, Kolsy, Rivera et al, and Shafron et al teach an information providing apparatus of claim 11, *wherein the format information includes an extensible stylesheet language (XSL) file*, as explained in the claim rejection of claim 11 above, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 15, Saravanan, Kolsy, Rivera et al, and Shafron et al teach an information providing apparatus of claim 14, *wherein the frame page creator converts the identification information contained in the first URL into XML data, and applies the XML data to the XSL file to create the frame page*, as explained in the claim rejection of claim 11 above, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 16, Saravanan, Kolsy, Rivera et al, and Shafron et al teach an information providing apparatus of claim 12, *wherein the frame page creator converts the identification information contained in the first URL into XML data, and the*

*data converting unit executes XSL transformation on the XML data*, as explained in the claim rejection of claim 11, above, and is rejected under the same rationale.

10. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000) and Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001) and in further view of Meffert et al (US Application: US 2003/0037261 A1, published: Feb. 20, 2003, filed: May 1, 2002).

With regards to claim 20, Saravanan and Kolsy teach a *second URL containing argument information*, as explained in claim 18, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Saravanan and Kolsy do not teach *an email creating unit configured to create an e-mail containing the second URL, the created e-mail being transmitted to the user terminal prior to receiving the second request*.

Meffert et al teaches *an email creating unit configured to create an email containing a URL, the created e-mail being transmitted to a user terminal prior to receiving a request (second request) for the retrieval of data* (paragraph 0050).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan and Kolsy's second URL to be included in an email message as taught by Meffert et al, and to also ensure the email is sent before a request for data (second request) as taught by Meffert et al. The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, and Meffert et al would have allowed Saravanan's information providing apparatus to have notified a user of an event/alarm prior to an information update/exchange via confirmation through an email.

With regards to claim 19, Saravanan and Kolsy teach a *second URL that includes the identification information but not having a path name*, in claim 17, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Saravanan and Kolsy does not teach an *e-mail creating unit configured to create an e-mail containing a second URL, the created e-mail being transmitted to the user terminal*.

Meffert et al teaches an *e-mail creating unit configured to create an e-mail containing a second URL, the created e-mail being transmitted to the user terminal*, as explained in the rejection of claim 20, and is rejected under the same rationale.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan, Kolsy, and Meffert et al's email creating unit, to further also have included a second URL that includes the identification information but not having a path name as also taught by Saravanan and Kolsy. The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, and Meffert et al would have allowed Saravanan's information providing apparatus to have notified a user of an event/alarm prior to an information update/exchange via confirmation through an email, and also would have allowed the user to have retrieved content without concern for a possible change in path information since the notification URL is path independent.

11. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000) and Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001), in further view of Matsuda et al (US Application: US 2001/0029521 A1, published: Oct 11, 2001, filed: Mar. 28, 2001).

With regards to claim 21, Saravanan teaches a server based *information processing apparatus*, as explained in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Saravanan does not teach the server based information processing apparatus is an *image processing apparatus*.

Matsuda et al teaches a server based *image processing apparatus* (paragraph 0020).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravnan's server based information processing apparatus to also include the ability execute a server based image processing apparatus as taught by Matsuda et al. The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, and Matsuda et al would have allowed Saravanan's information providing apparatus to have "notified the user of the status of such an apparatus by displaying it on a host computer" (paragraph 0004).

### ***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23, and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wilson Tsui whose telephone number is (571)272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/798,430

Page 23

Art Unit: 2178

*W.T. 9/15/06*

Wilson Tsui

Patent Examiner

Art Unit: 2178

September 15, 2006



STEPHEN HONG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER